

## **REMARKS**

### **Introduction**

Claims 1-3, 5-9, and 13-15 are pending. Claims 1 and 7 are independent. Claims 1-3, 5-9, and 13-15 have been amended. Claims 4, 10-12, and 16 have been cancelled.

### **Objection to the Specification**

As suggested by the Examiner and required by MPEP § 608.01, embedded hyperlinks present in paragraphs [0035] and [0037] of the application as published have been removed.

### **Claim Objections**

Claims 2-6 and 8-16 have been objected to because of certain informalities noted by the Examiner. By this Amendment, the pending claims have been amended according to the suggestions of the Examiner. No new matter is added by way of these amendments. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections to claims 2, 3, 5-9 and 13-15 is requested.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101**

Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101, as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. By this Amendment, the pending claims have been amended to address the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejections. More specifically, claims 1-3, 5, and 6 have been amended so that various pieces of software data outputs are displayed to a user in a web browser on a display. Claim 7, and thus claims 8, 9, and 13-15 dependent therefrom, are now directed to an apparatus for obtaining a status for each of a plurality of queues comprising at least one processor for running an application server. Support for a processor is found in the application as published in FIG. 1 and throughout the written description wherever the term “server” is

mentioned. It is well known to those skilled in the art that a server can refer to either a software application, a hardware platform, or both. Paragraph [0030] has been amended to further clarify the description of the system, which states that each of the servers runs on one or more processors, or can be run on the same processor. Since running one or more servers on one or more processors is an architecture which is known to those skilled in the art, no new matter is added by way of these amendments. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections to claim 1, claims 3, 5, and 6 depending therefrom, claim 7, and claims 8, 9, and 13-15 dependent therefrom, under 35 U.S.C. § 101, is requested.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1, 3-7, and 10-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,046,742 (Chari) in view of “MIB for FIFO, Priority, Custom, and Fair Queueing,” (Baker).

Chari describes method for organizing and displaying management information regarding the hardware and software components in a computer network. The software modules of Chari employ SNMP protocol with access to a management information base (MIB) to organize the data into major component groups and comprise a plurality of operational parameters about different components in a computer network. The operational parameters are organized into a plurality of hierarchical levels. The method further comprises a plurality of forms which enable the modification of one or more of the operational parameters. Each of the forms correspond to one of the hierarchical levels.

According to the Examiner, Chari discloses sending a query requesting queue status to an application server, which is the SNMP Manager. An MIB manager module calls the SNMP manager module to get the queue data from the network. The queue data is delivered to

the user on a display in a tree-like structure (FIG. 16). It is a plurality of software modules which employ the SNMP protocol which receive the queue information and render the tree structure.

In contrast to the method described by Chari, amended claims 1 and 7 of the present application recite, *inter alia*, a method and an apparatus configured to execute steps for sending a query regarding status of one or more queues to an application server which includes at least one java bean and a tree renderer; distributing said query to one or more message servers on multiple platforms; receiving queue status information from said one or more message servers at said at least one java bean; processing the queue status information into sorted categories by the at least one java bean; providing the sorted categories to said tree renderer by the at least one java bean; processing said sorted categories into a tree structure by said tree renderer; and delivering the status of said one or more queues to a user in a web browser on a display.

Nowhere in Chari is it described, taught, or is a motivation provided for receiving queue status information from one or more message servers at at least one **java bean**; **processing the queue status information into sorted categories by the at least one java bean**; and **providing the sorted categories to said tree renderer by the at least one java bean**. Chari discloses using SNMP protocol executed by SNMP compatible modules, particularly the MIB Manager Module 402, and MIB Section Module 404, and MIB Variable module 406 to retrieve the queue data. As cited by the Examiner, the SNMP Window module 416 is responsible for deriving a tree structure from retrieved MIB data. This SNMP Window Module 416 does not employ java beans for sorting the queue data into categories and delivering the sorted data to a tree renderer for constructing and displaying a tree structure. A java bean is a class which encapsulates several classes for performing a plurality of tasks which are passed around as a single entity or object. The modules of Chari do not disclose classes that are

encapsulated and passed along as a single class, only the use of a MIB under SNMP protocol. Accordingly, applicant submits that Chari does not describe, teach, or provide motivation for the invention recited by amended claims 1 and 7 of the present application.

Baker fails to correct the deficiencies of Chari. Baker merely describes SNMP code for monitoring queue status. There is no mention of code for implementing java beans which sort the queue data into categories and deliver the sorted data to a tree renderer. As such, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on Chari in view of Baker is requested.

Each of pending claims 3, 5, and 6 ultimately depend from claim 1 and claims 10-12 ultimately depend from claim 7. Pending dependent claims 3, 5, 6, and 10-12 are deemed to be patentable over Chari in view of Baker, for at least the reasons described above with respect to the patentability of claim 1 and 7.

Claims 2, 7, and 13-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Chari in view of Baker and further in view of NNRD435152 “Bloodhound Server Monitor Package” (IBM). IBM fails to correct the deficiencies of Chari and Baker. As cited by the Examiner, IBM describes using a web browser to access a network monitoring program. There is no mention of code for implementing java beans which sort queue data into categories and deliver the sorted data to a tree renderer. Accordingly, claims 1 and 7 are deemed patentable over Chari in view of Baker and further in view of IBM. As such, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 2, which depends from claim 1, 7, and pending claims 13-15, which depend from claim 7, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on Chari in view of Baker and further in view of IBM is requested.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Chari in view of “Java 2 Platform Enterprise Edition Specification v1.2” (Shannon). Shannon fails to correct the deficiencies of Chari. Shannon merely discloses the specification of a J2EE

application server. Although the table of contents of Shannon mentions Enterprise JavaBeans™ Components under section 4.2.2, there is no teaching or suggestion of code for implementing java beans which sort queue data into categories and deliver the sorted data to a tree renderer. As such, claim 7 is deemed patentable over Chari in view of Shannon. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 9, which depends from claim 7, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on Chari in view of Shannon requested.

Thus, applicant submits that each of the claims of the present application are patentable over each of the references of record, either taken alone, or in any proposed hypothetical combination. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections to the claims is respectfully requested.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the present application is respectfully requested. No fee is believed to be due in connection with this Amendment. If, however, other fees are deemed necessary for this Amendment to be entered and considered by the Examiner, then the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fee to Deposit Account No. 50-1358. Applicant's undersigned patent agent may be reached by telephone at (973) 597-2500. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 4/20/07

  
Raymond G. Cappo  
Patent Agent for Applicant  
Registration No. 53,836

DOCKET ADMINISTRATOR  
LOWENSTEIN SANDLER PC  
65 Livingston Avenue  
Roseland, NJ 07068